REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-30 are pending in this application. Claims 15, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent application publication 2002/0032907 to Daniels. Claims 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, 26, 29, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Daniels in view of the vCalendar Specification, v0.4 (herein "the vCalendar Specification").

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response as discussed next.

Each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 15 now recites the server configured to store a program table "simultaneously displaying a plurality of programs with respective request buttons for record reservation data, such that each displayed program has a corresponding request button for record reservation data". The other independent claims are similarly amended. That subject matter is believed to be clear for example from Figure 16 in the present specification.

As shown for example in Figure 16 in the present specification data (Electronic Program Guide (EPG)) to display a screen such as shown for example in Figure 16 is sent by an external apparatus (a server). Such a display is a program table simultaneously displaying programs each with a respective request button for record reservation data 251. That is, a different request button for record reservation data 251 is provided for each respective individual program to allow selecting of the individual programs. A user can review that program table and select programs on the program table by selecting one of the respective request buttons for record reservation data 251 on the program table corresponding to a respective program. The server can then transmit record reservation data to a remote device

based on the user selection of the request buttons for record reservation data on the program table. That is, the data (the EPG Program) sends a signal that requests the scheduling data of one program according to a respective pressed request button for record reservation data to the external apparatus (server). Thereby, the record reservation can be downloaded to a user.

With such a structure the volume of the EPG data received at one time can be decreased as only the data is provided corresponding to one selected program based on one selected request button for record reservation data. Thereby, scheduling of a television program can be realized even with a communication line with a slow transmission rate.

Applicants respectfully submit the above-noted features clarified in the claims distinguish over the applied art.

Applicants respectfully submit Daniels does not disclose or suggest the feature clarified in the claims to the display directed to the stored program table. Specifically, applicants submit Daniels does not disclose or suggest storing a program table:

> ...simultaneously displaying a plurality of programs with respective request buttons for record reservation data, such that each displayed program has a corresponding request button for record reservation data [.]

With respect to the feature previously recited in the claims, the outstanding Office Action states:

> Figures 19, 36, and 37 illustrate a plurality of programs with respective selection buttons in column C. Figure 23 illustrates a plurality of programs with respective selection buttons in column F. This meets the limitation of "a program table simultaneously displaying a plurality of programs with respective selection buttons, such that each displayed program has a corresponding selection button," as currently claimed. The examiner further notes that a record reservation can be set based on the program selected by the user (Figs. 19, 23, 36, 37). This meets the limitation of "the server further configured to transmit record reservation data to the remote device of the user based on the user selections of the buttons in the program table," as currently claimed. Similarly, Daniels further discloses program grid arrangements in which a user selects a program by either scrolling to the desired program in the grid

> (p. 15, paragraph 151 & Fig. 24) or by selecting an alphanumeric value on the input device that corresponds to the desired program (p. 17, paragraph 168 & Fig. 42). This also meets the limitations of "a program table simultaneously displaying a plurality of programs with respective selection buttons, such that each displayed program has a corresponding selection button" and "the server further configured to transmit record reservation data to the remote device of the user based on the user selections of the buttons in the program table," as currently claimed.

In reply to the above-noted grounds for rejection, Applicants respectfully submit Daniels clearly does not disclose or suggest the features now clarified in the claims, and particularly Daniels does not disclose or suggest that any program table ***simultaneously displays*** a plurality of programs ***each with a respective request button for record reservation data***. Again with reference to Figure 16 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, a display according to the present invention simultaneously displays a plurality of programs with respective request buttons for record reservation 251. That feature is neither taught nor suggested by Daniels.

The above-noted grounds for the rejection indicates in each of Figures 19, 36, and 37 Daniels illustrates a plurality of programs with respective selection buttons in column C.

In reply to that grounds for rejection Applicants note in each of those Figures 19, 36, and 37 Daniels does ***not*** disclose that column C includes request buttons for record reservation data. Instead, in Figures 19, 36, and 37 of Daniels column D includes the "(2) RECORD" selection. Further, that "(2) RECORD" selection in column D is clearly ***not*** provided for each displayed program. In the examples in Figures 19, 36, and 37 in Daniels only after the program "Guligan's Island" in column C is selected will a request button for RECORD reservation only for Guligan's Island appear in column D.

Stated another way, in each of Figures 19, 36, and 37 Daniels does ***not*** disclose or suggest providing a request button for record reservation data for each of the programs (1) General Hope, (2) Gerry Rivers, (3) Guligan's Island, (4) Hogie's Heroes, and (5) I Dream of

Jenny. Instead, in Daniels, in contrast to the claims as written, a request button for record reservation data is only provided in ***column D*** for a ***single*** of the programs in column C, after that program in column C is selected.

Again with reference to Figure 16 in the specification as a non-limiting example, in contrast to Daniels, each of the programs simultaneously displayed according to the claimed invention includes its own button 251, which is a request button for record reservation data. Daniels does not disclose or suggest such features.

The above-quoted basis for the rejection also notes "Figure 23 [in Daniels] illustrates a plurality of programs with respective selection buttons in column F".

In reply to that grounds for rejection applicants submit the claims recite a different operation than that in Figure 23 in Daniels.

In Figure 23 Daniels discloses being able to navigate through multiple columns on a web page and again allowing a ***final column G*** to include a record operation that can be selected, similarly as in Figures 19, 36, and 37. Again in Figure 23 in Daniels each program that is simultaneously displayed does ***not*** have its own request button for record reservation data, as now clarified in the claims as written. Instead in Daniels only a single selection button in column G in Figure 23 will appear, after the other different columns are navigated through. Thereby, that further disclosure in Daniels is not at all directed to the claims as currently written.

In such ways the claims as written are believed to clearly distinguish over Daniels.

Moreover, no teachings in the vCalendar Specification are believed to cure the deficiencies of Daniels.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the claims as written distinguish over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

BDL:SNS\la

I:\ATTY\SNS\20's\209880\209880US-AM2.DOC